



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

is plain that Plutarch conceives that Plato in the *Philebus* meant by the *περὶ μέτρον* the idea, and by τὸ σύμμετρον the visible copy.

Latent allusions to Plato such as this and latent quotations are very common, of course, in Plutarch. Several other examples may be cited from this same Question: in 718 D there is a very close parallel to *Phaedo* 83 D; in 718 E, a phrase taken directly from *Republic* 527 E; and in 718 F an almost exact quotation of a phrase in *Phaedrus* 249 C.

ROGER MILLER JONES

TULANE UNIVERSITY

A NOTE ON THE VOCATIVE IN HERODOTUS AND IN HOMER

The works dealing with Greek syntax in general state that the omission of *ō* with the vocative in Greek prose is either late or passionate.¹ Professor John A. Scott has shown by his statistics of the vocative in Herodotus that the statement that the omission of *ō* with the vocative is late is not justified by the facts. He holds that the omission of *ō* instead of indicating excitement, as former writers have maintained, shows respect and reserve.

By a study of the vocatives in Herodotus made in ignorance of Professor Scott's work on the vocative I was led to the conclusion that the omission of *ō* in this writer signifies familiarity or condescension on the part of the speaker. I would call attention to the following points. A very large proportion of proper names in Herodotus which are found without *ō* in the vocative is addressed by an oriental king to his subordinates. The interjection never appears in such an address. The subordinates, however, in the great majority of cases, address their lord as *ō βασιλεῦ*. There are, I find, but six cases of the simple *βασιλεῦ*. Of these the first is in an emotional sentence: *βασιλεῦ, κοῖον ἐφθέγξαιο ἔπος* (v. 106); the others indicate familiarity or a sense of equality in social rank, as in the case of the exiled king of Sparta, Demaratus (vi. 102, 104); Queen Artemisia (viii. 102), Mardonius (viii. 100, this also emotional), Masistes, the king's brother (ix. 111). Croesus, so long as he is king, is addressed *ō Κροῖσε* (i. 32, *bis*); after his downfall always *Κροῖσε* (i. 87, 90 *bis*, 155).

With the vocative of *ἄναξ*, *ō* is, I believe, always used. With *δέσποτα* I find more cases where it is used than of the omission. But in this case the word itself implies such obsequiousness on the part of the user that the dropping of the formal *ō* expresses only a familiar relation of a slave or an inferior to a great lord.

It is true that "the familiar family greetings . . . have the interjection" as a rule in Herodotus, but there is the significant instance where the little Gorgo says: *πάτερ, διαφθερεί σε ὁ ξείνος ἦν μὴ ἀποστὰς ἱης*.

We find always *ō Ἀθηναῖοι* and the like and with but one exception *ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι*, etc. I cannot think that in ix. 89 *ō ἄνδρες Θεσσαλοί* of the fleeing Artabazus is "intended to picture his perplexity or his coarseness."

¹ See Riemann et Goelzer, Kühner-Gerth, Gildersleeve.

The closest parallel to the effect of omitting ω with the vocative in Herodotus is the use of *du* in German (and in general the use of the second person singular in several modern languages) in addressing inferiors in rank and children as well as with intimates.

In the articles on the vocative in Homer and Hesiod by the same author (*AJP* XXIV, 192 ff.) there are interpretations of the omission of ω in certain cases which appear untenable: for example, that "woman's attitude was too reserved" to permit women the use of ω in the Homeric poems. Penelope allows herself to say " $\kappa\acute{\omicron}\nu\omicron\nu\delta\epsilon\epsilon\acute{\varsigma}$ " which could hardly be heightened by ω and is as strong as the ω $\kappa\upsilon\nu\acute{\alpha}\mu\nu\iota\alpha$ of Ares adduced in illustration. Iris and Hera employ the same unrestrained expression in addressing Athena and Artemis respectively.

Again, the following statement seems questionable: "It is exactly characteristic of the attitude of Odysseus and the impression that he tried to make that in the presence of Nausicaa and Alcinous as told in vi, vii, viii, he never uses ω . In these scenes he wishes to appear worthy and dignified. On his return to Ithaca he tries to be mean and ignoble and so he uses freely the interjection. He uses six vocatives with ω in xix, 187-382." But it must be observed that three of these cases consist of the highly reverential line, ω $\gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota$ $\alpha\iota\delta\omicron\iota\eta$ $\Lambda\alpha\epsilon\rho\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha\delta\epsilon\omega$ $\text{'}\omicron\delta\upsilon\sigma\eta\gamma\omicron\varsigma$. The other three are the respectful ω $\gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota$ (*bis*) addressed by the supposed beggar to the lady of the house and ω $\gamma\rho\eta$ addressed to the fine old nurse, Eurycleia.

The explanation of the use of ω with the patronymic ω Νέστωρ Νηλιάδῃ on the ground that "Homer does not take Nestor very seriously" appears inadequate. In regard to the tone of the interjection in *Iliad* xxiv surely ω $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\nu$ of Hermes is more respectful than the repeated $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\nu$ of the angry Achilles. In softened mood the latter says: $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\nu$ $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\epsilon$ and $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\nu$ Πρίάμῃ . Compare Agamemnon in anger to the priest, $\mu\acute{\eta}$ $\sigma\epsilon$, $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\nu$ (*A.* 26).

I believe that there are two reasons for the frequent occurrence of the vocative in Early Epic without ω : the large number of other words used in addition to the simple vocative in the nature of epithets, and the fact that the social equality and simplicity of Homeric society is expressed by the intimate dropping of the formal ω .

GRACE HARRIET MACURDY

VASSAR COLLEGE

THE DELPHIAN STADIUM INSCRIPTION

- Τὸν φοῖνον μὲ φάρην ἐς τοῦ δρ|όμου· αἱ δὲ κα φάρει, *χιλαξάστῳ* | τὸν
 5 θὸν ᾗ|οι κα κεραίε|ται καὶ | μεταθυσάτῳ ἀποτεισάτῳ πέν|τε δραχμάς·
 τοῦτου δὲ τοῖ κατα|γορέσαντι τὸ *ἡμίμσον*.

This inscription, of which the corrected text is repeated here for the convenience of the reader, has already endured several vicissitudes of reading and interpretation. The reading is settled, but the interpretation